

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7, and 47 have been amended. Claims 4-5, 11-13, 15-46, 48, 57-86 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 87 and 88 are newly added. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 14, 47, 49-56 and 87-88 are now pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claim 86 because there are 2 articles before “secure router advertisement” in line 5 of the claim.” Claim 86 has been canceled and therefore the rejections as to Claim 86 is now moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 86 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 7,155,500 (“Nickander”). Claim 86 has been canceled and therefore rejection as to Claim 86 is now moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

1. Claims 1-6 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 7,130,614 (“Sreemanthula”) in view of in view of US Patent No. 6,970,459 (“Meier”). In addition, Claims 7-11 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Sreemanthula in view of US Patent No. 6,970,459 (“Meier”) in further view of Nickander. Claims 4-5, 11 and 13 have been canceled and therefore rejections as to these claims are now moot. As to Claims 1-3, 7-10, and 14, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references.

As to independent Claim 1, as amended, Claim 1 recites “receiving from an access router a secure router advertisement at the mobile node, the secure router advertisement including a router advertisement nonce field which includes a copy of a value of the router solicitation nonce field, the value of the router solicitation nonce field being the identifier of the mobile node sent in the secure router solicitation.” Support for amendments to Claim 1 can be found in the as filed specification, on page 10 and 11.

Sreemanthula and Meier, alone or in combination, do not disclose receiving at a mobile node a secure router advertisement that includes the identifier of the mobile node which was previously sent by the mobile node to the router. In rejecting Claims 4, 5, and 6, the Office Action cites Sreemanthula, column 12, lines 1–7, and Meier, Column 7, lines 19–25, as disclosing receiving from an access router a secure router advertisement at the mobile node, the secure router advertisement including a router advertisement nonce field which includes a copy of a value of the router solicitation nonce field. *See*, Office Action, Pages 7, 8.

Sreemanthula, column 12, lines 1–7, reads: “Alternatively, for obtaining the identification element(s), the new CAP may inform the MN1 to send a Router Solicitation in order to request the AR to generate a Router Advertisement immediately. As a further alternative, the new CAP could also send a proxy Router Solicitation to the AR so that the AR is forced to send a unicast Router Advertisement.”

This section discusses a cell access point (CAP) informing a mobile node (MN) to send a router solicitation to request an access router (AR) to generate the advertisement. However, there is no mention in this section, or anywhere else in the Sreemanthula reference, of the MN sending a secure router solicitation that includes the

identifier of the mobile node, and further receiving as a response a router advertisement that includes the identifier of the mobile node.

Furthermore, Meier, Colum 7, lines 19–25, reads: “An MVTP data link foreign agent advertisement or solicitation PDU is sent to an MVTP 802 multicast address. Mobile IP advertisement and solicitation messages are sent to the IP limited broadcast address and the 802 broadcast address. An advertisement PDU, sent in response to a solicitation PDU, is transmitted to the unicast 802 address that is the source address in the solicitation PDU.”

The Office Action indicates that this section of Meier discloses “the source address (identifier) of the client is included in the solicitation message).” *See*, Office Action, Page 7, Lines 9–11. Furthermore, the Office Action also states that this section of Meier discloses “the secure router advertisement including the identifier of the mobile node.” *See*, Office Action, Page 7, Lines 12–14. Applicants disagree. This section of Meier discloses a solicitation message being sent to a multicast address, and a response message to a “solicitation PDU” being transmitted to the unicast address. When Meier discusses the “source address,” it is making reference back to the unicast address. It is not discussing an identifier or address of the solicitation PDU being included in the advertisement. Nowhere else in Meier is there a discussion of a router including an identifier of the mobile node as part of the advertisement message.

2. Claims 47 and 49–56 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Sreemanthula in further view of Nickander. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references.

As to independent Claim 47, as amended, Claim 47 recites “at least the purported identifier of the mobile node is included in the nonce field of the secure

router advertisement, the secure router advertisement been received by the mobile node from an authorized access router.”

Sreemanthula and Nickander, alone or in combination, do not disclose “at least the purported identifier of the mobile node is included in the nonce field of the secure router advertisement, the secure router advertisement been received by the mobile node from an authorized access router.” Sreemanthula is a system for reducing IP level signaling and radio resource load during the attachment or update of a mobile unit to a cellular wireless communication network. *See*, Sreemanthula Abstract. In Sreemanthula, an identification element is transmitted from the mobile unit to one of the access network elements. In addition, the identification element is not placed in the router advertisement as in the present application.

Applicants note that the Office Action uses Nickander, Colum 11, Line 4 to Column 12, Line 28, to reject the element of “an identifier in the registration request.” *See*, Office Action, Page 11, Line 9. The Office Action states that Nickander teaches: “in response to a solicitation message an advertisement is generated and populated with an identifier, the tentative address or TA, of the request node as well as other information.” *Id.* Nickander does not discuss a router advertisement that is sent in response to a solicitation. Nowhere in the cited text, or anywhere else in Nickander is there a discussion of including a mobile node identifier in a router advertisement. Nickander is concerned with verifying that a host coupled to an IP network is authorized to use an IP address which the host claims to own, the IP address comprising a routing prefix and an interface identifier part. Applicant submits that Claims 47 and 49–56 are not rendered obvious by Sreemanthula in view of Nickander.

For at least the above-identified reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 47 are patentable over Sreemanthula, Nickander, and Maier alone, or in

combination, and are allowable. Given that claims 1–3, 7–10, and 14 depend from claim 1 and claims 49–56 depend from claim 47 respectively, claims 1–3, 7–10, 14, and 49–56 are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

New Claims

Claims 87 and 88 have been newly added and present no new matter. Claim 87 is supported at least in page 10, line 22 of the as-filed patent application. Claim 88 is supported at least in page 10, line 23 of the as-filed patent application.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited references and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this response, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

PATENT

Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by the enclosed fee transmittal, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: March 6, 2008

By: /Pablo E. Tapia/

Pablo Tapia, Reg. No.: 52,275
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone: (425) 707-0058
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

March 6, 2008
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Noemi Tovar

Application Number: 10/736,952
Attorney Docket Number: 305425.02